

Chang, Lisa

From: Chang, Lisa
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2015 12:13 PM
To: Bonifaci, Angela
Subject: Link to NEP/Management Conference
Attachments: 6-2-15 Briefing for PSTM and OD.docx; RE: Swinomish FY14 Proposal

Angela,

I just did a quick review of all sections of Section 320. There is nothing about MCs working "collaboratively" – no language about how MCs work together, only language about what types of entities must be included in the MC. The stuff about working "collaboratively" only appears to be in the FAQs from HQ.

So, strictly speaking, I think we can say that the proposed project is inconsistent with Section 320 guidance, but I am not sure we can say it is inconsistent with Section 320 itself. (This may bring up a fair question of whether we have done enough to be clear with the LOs about what guidance or regulations we expect them to be consistent with. None of them have had training in what it means to be part of a Management Conference, and all the helpful HQ guidance.)

I do think that even though the proposed work theoretically is in the Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan and thus in the Action Agenda, the way it is being implemented is not consistent with either the SCRP or the AA, for reasons spelled out in the briefing we had with Dan a few weeks ago (attached), and in our comments to Swinomish with this year's proposal (also attached). And I think our agreement with NWIFC is that they hew to the Action Agenda, and not EPA guidance on the Management Conference.

Lisa

Chang, Lisa

From: Chang, Lisa
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 5:06 PM
To: Tiffany Waters; Scott Williamson
Cc: Bonifacino, Gina; Bonifaci, Angela
Subject: RE: Swinomish FY14 Proposal

Hi Tiffany,

Thanks for the opportunity to review this proposal. Below is some initial feedback, as discussed on the phone today.

Here is an initial comment:

- 1) The proposal cites the following passage from the Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan (SCRП):

"Successful habitat protection depends on three important components. First is a public that recognizes the importance of salmon habitat protection, and that does not condone actions by others that do harm to these resources. This sentiment should be nurtured through a vigorous public information effort, and by providing the technical information to assist landowners and others in their efforts to comply with existing regulations. Technical and financial resources should also be made available to those who voluntarily want to do even more to protect and restore salmon habitat if they so choose. Providing people with the information to make informed decisions that will be protective of salmon habitat when working in and around streams is the first step towards habitat protection. To summarize, providing people the tools to "do the right thing" capitalizes on the vast majority of the public that wants to provide for a future for Skagit River Chinook. "

To me this suggests a public education effort that reaches and educates not only the general public, but all those "working in and around streams" – the agricultural sector as well. It suggests that the aspiration is a collaborative effort, where those "working in and around streams" and the general public are aware of, and have the tools to, protect and restore salmon habitat.

- 2) However, on pp. 5-6, the workplan suggests that the proposed outreach/education work has shifted away from the approach that seems to be laid out in the SCRП and no longer involves engaging/educating all those who "work in and around streams": The current goal of the proposed work is to "raise awareness in both the public and decision makers about accountability in the agriculture industry where non-point source pollution and our state's water resources are concerned..." and this would be done through "highly visible distribution channels...earned media stories in relevant print, television, radio and online channels...18 ads in Washington newspapers...and 4 billboard displays in King, Skagit, and Whatcom counties."

We would like to further discuss the shift in emphasis between the original narrative and it's solid basis in the SCRП and the actual direction of this project as we understand it from today's conversations and the FY14 proposal and would appreciate it if we could have a conversation with NWIFC and the subawardee before work proceeds much further.

Thanks very much,

Lisa

From: Tiffany Waters [mailto:twaters@nwifc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2015 10:19 AM

To: Chang, Lisa; Scott Williamson
Subject: Swinomish FY14 Proposal

Hello Lisa and Scott,

Enclosed is Swinomish's second FY14 proposal for your review. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call or email.

Thanks!
Tiffany

Tiffany Waters
Puget Sound Recovery Projects Coordinator
6730 Martin Way E., Olympia, WA 98516
(p) 360.528.4318

6/2/15 Briefing for OWW OD and PST PM on Swinomish Public Outreach/Education Project
DRAFT lhc 6/2/15

- **History of “public outreach” project** and relevant exchange between EPA, NWIFC, and Swinomish
 - **2011. Initial proposal for this project came in 2011.** Purpose of project was to first collect information on public perceptions of water quality in the Skagit Basin, and then to conduct a public education effort that would lead to improved practices and regulatory certainty that instream resources would be protected, consistent with the Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan.

(b)(5) ACP

- **2013 funding.** Swinomish added to the project that the desired “final outcome of this project will be a ballot initiative during the 2014 election cycle to require regulations to provide for riparian buffers on agricultural lands bordering salmon streams.”

- One of the outputs of the award was the “whatsupstream.com” website, with ads on NPR and elsewhere pointing to this website.
- I raised this to Rick, who in turn raised this to Dennis, and Tom Eaton.

(b)(5) ACP

- Following discussion between Rick, Larry, and NWIFC, Larry decided to limit the proposal to the broad public outreach and education on non-point water quality issues that they had been pursuing under the grant. They decided that none of the work on a ballot initiative would be pursued with NEP funds.
- Side note: Swinomish also explored using funds from a CWA citizen suit (against a Dike District) consent decree to campaign on behalf of the riparian buffer initiative. When I last heard about this in late 2013, it seemed that Swinomish ultimately did not pursue that.

- **May, 2015.** Swinomish submitted a revised proposal for the same project, significantly increasing activity under the “public education” element of the project. See attached e-mail from Lisa to Tiffany dated 5/19/15.

- **Consistency with Action Agenda:**

- **Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan:** “Successful habitat protection depends on three important components. First is a public that recognizes the importance of salmon habitat protection, and that does not condone actions by others that do harm to these resources. This sentiment should be nurtured through a vigorous public information effort, and by providing the technical information to assist landowners and others in their efforts to comply with existing regulations. Technical and financial resources should also be made available to those who voluntarily want to

do even more to protect and restore salmon habitat if they so choose. Providing people with the information to make informed decisions that will be protective of salmon habitat when working in and around streams is the first step towards habitat protection. To summarize, providing people the tools to "do the right thing" capitalizes on the vast majority of the public that wants to provide for a future for Skagit River Chinook."

- **A3.2 Retain economically viable working forests and farms:** Agricultural lands. As described earlier, since 1950 we have lost more than half of the farmland in the Puget Sound region. Effectively preserving agricultural land will involve tackling a complex set of interrelated issues including real work to ensure that agriculture continues to be a viable, and vibrant, industry in Puget Sound.
- **A.3.2.2 Agriculture strategy.** The Partnership, in collaboration with WSDA, Ecology, WSCC, and agricultural partners has convened an advisory committee to consider development of a Puget Sound agricultural strategy. The strategy will identify a) needs for maintaining the health of the industry b) key areas where the agricultural industry can contribute to the protection and restoration of Puget Sound and c) challenges to be addressed for achieving these goals and implementing a successful strategy. This near term action could be further amended or integrated into the regional funding strategy as appropriate.
- **D2. Support and Build Strategic, Collaborative Partnerships.** Effective partner relationships are essential for achieving a shared vision of recovery and working through challenging issues. This strategy highlights three important areas of broad collaboration—that differ from the issue-specific collaboration described elsewhere in Section 3. A description of Partnership-related collaborative structures and partnerships is included in Appendix A, Puget Sound National Estuary Program Management Conference Overview.
- **D2.1 Advance the coordination of local recovery actions via local integrating organizations.** Many locally based groups exist for salmon recovery, marine resource conservation through the Northwest Straits Initiative, watershed management (RCW 90.82) and protection, and water quality. In any given area, there are many local groups working on recovery-related activities, and these groups are often not adequately connected to each other. The Partnership is working with local interests to better coordinate implementing partners, and create a more effective and collaborative approach to clarify local priorities, accomplish identified work, address problems, and provide technical support.
- **Potential remedies**
 - Recommend adjustments to project to better align with NEP, Management Conference, and Action Agenda
 - Recommend that alternate sources of funding be used for work that conflicts with NEP, Management Conference, and Action Agenda goals and objectives
 - Other?
- **Next steps**
 - Discussion between Angela/Dan and Larry?
 - Other?